

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**

224



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/803,406      | 03/09/2001  | Gerald E. Loeb       | 20441/21            | 4796             |

33401 7590 08/26/2004

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY (LOS ANGELES OFFICE)  
2049 CENTURY PARK EAST  
34TH FLOOR  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067-3208

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

LEZAK, ARRIENNE M

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2143

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|                              |                                      |  |  |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Office Action Summary</b> | <b>Application No.</b><br>09/803,406 | <b>Applicant(s)</b><br>LOEB, GERALD E. |  |
|                              | <b>Examiner</b><br>Arrienne M. Lezak | <b>Art Unit</b><br>2143                |  |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/23/2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 6, 9-12, 15, 20, 21 & 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over extensive consideration of US Patent US 6,249,809 B1 to Bro.

3. An audio/video-call system for allowing communication between a first user and a second user, wherein the communication includes an audio stream, a video stream, and a data stream, (Abstract, Cols. 1-12), the system comprising:

- a first and second, (or multiple – per pending Claim 6), (Col. 7, lines 61-67), communication systems separated geographically, wherein the first user alone, (per Claims 9 & 10) or the first user and the second, (or third, etc.) user each control one of the communication systems, and wherein each of the communication systems include a video camera, a microphone, an Internet, (Col. 6, lines 51-54) socket for connecting the communication system to the Internet, and a phone socket for connecting the communication system to a phone line, (Col. 2, lines 30-67; Col. 3, lines 1—67; and Col. 4, lines 1-33). (Examiner notes that as Bro teaches a client telecommunication interface, said interface would obviously include a video camera and microphone, as a video camera and microphone are both recording/communicating

Art Unit: 2143

means and the same would have been obvious within a system requiring an ability to record and transmit a multimedia signal to, from and between patients and care givers);

- wherein the Internet is used for sending a data stream initiating a call from the first communication system to the second communication system, (or third, etc.), and for transmitting the video stream and the data stream between the first and the second , (or third) communication systems once the call is initiated, (Col. 10, lines 42-44); and

- wherein once the call is initiated, the phone line is used for sending the audio stream between the first user and the second, (or third, etc.) user, (Col. 2, lines 62-66; Col. 5, lines 55-58; and Col. 6, lines 32-35), (Examiner notes that in light of the teachings of Bro, it would have been obvious to send the audio stream through the phone line as the phone line has traditionally been the means by which audio streams are transmitted); and

- wherein a request from the first communication system to establish a communication link with the second communication system causes the second communication system to automatically display to the second user a set of choices, ("refuse call", "accept audio call only" and "accept audio and video call" – per pending Claim 12), on a television; wherein the television is either on or is activated on as a result of the request, and wherein the response of the second user to one of the set of choices results in the call being established or the call being refused, (per pending Claim 11), (Col. 4, lines 19-32; Col. 7, lines 7-38; and Col. 10, lines 42-55), (Examiner notes that Applicant's specific set of choices would have been obvious in view of Bro

which teaches client interaction through a screen interface and such choices as those enumerated by Applicant would be obvious and well known communication options); or

- wherein the first communication system also has a passkey mode of operation which allows the first communication system to establish communication with the second communication system without the second communication system responding to any request, (per pending Claim 15), (Col. 4, lines 26-32; Col. 6, lines 15-22; Col. 7, lines 39-67; Col. 8, lines 3-11; and Col. 10, lines 30-42), (Examiner notes that Bro teaches an automatic client connection, a smart card with memory, (per pending Claim 25), a magnetic card reader and a client ID number, the combination of which renders obvious Applicant's passkey mode as it is obvious that said smart card would include said client ID for security/access purposes); or

- wherein the communication system has a memory and an Internet socket for connecting to the Internet and a phone socket for connecting to a phone line, (Col. 10, lines 42-44); and wherein without the intervention of the user, an operator downloads a file to the memory which associates an identification object to the telephone number of a person to be called and the network address of the computer of the person to be called, (per pending Claim 21), (Col. 7, lines 39-67; Col. 8, lines 3-19; Col. 9, lines 53-58; Col. 10, lines 30-67; and Col. 11, lines 1-26), (Examiner notes that Bro teaches an automatic client connection, a smart card, a magnetic card reader, a client ID number, a virtual call center, a live operator and a client database, the combination of which renders obvious Applicant's operator interaction as it would have been obvious to for a live or virtual operator to connect directly to a client or caregiver

through database information upon login or smart card use as said smart card would have sufficient information for connection and further, the convenience of a smart card access to an operator/virtual call center would make access easier for both patients and care givers – especially in emergency situations). Thus, Claims 1, 6, 9-12, 15, 20, 21 & 25 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.

4. Regarding Claims 2, 3 & 26, Bro discloses an audio/video-call system further comprising a remote control system for issuing commands to the communication systems, (per pending Claim 2), (Col. 3, lines 5-27; Col. 4, lines 54-58; Col. 5, lines 16-41; and Col. 8, line 21), and wherein the remote control system includes a housing containing a set of user-activated buttons, a transmitter, and the microphone, (as noted obvious above), where in response to the user pressing one of the user-activated buttons, the transmitter sends a command to a television, (Col. 4, lines 33-63 & Col. 12, lines 42-43), and wherein when the user speaks during an audio/visual call, the microphone converts the voice of the user to an audio signal, and the transmitter sends the audio signal to the audio/video call system, (per pending Claims 3 & 26), (Col. 5, lines 24-30; Col. 6, lines 39-67; Col. 7, lines 1-33; Col. 10, lines 56-67; and Col. 11, lines 1-18). Thus, Claims 2, 3 & 26 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.

5. Regarding Claims 4 & 5, Bro discloses an audio/video-call system further comprising a television socket for coupling the first communication system to a television, wherein the video stream and available commands to control the first communication system is displayed on the television, (per pending Claim 4), and

wherein the television includes a speaker which broadcasts the audio stream once the call is initiated, (per pending Claim 5), (Col. 6, lines 39-67; Col. 7, lines 1-24; and Col. 10, lines 42-44), (Examiner notes that as Bro teaches the delivery of voice and visual messages on a television, the incorporation of speakers into the same would have been obvious and well known, as speakers are necessary for receipt of an audio signal). Thus, Claims 4 & 5 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.

6. Regarding Claims 7, 13, 14 & 19, Bro discloses an audio/video-call system wherein the first user is a caregiver and the second user is an elderly or disabled individual, (Abstract & Col. 3, lines 5-27). Thus, Claims 7, 13, 14 & 19 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.

7. Regarding Claim 8, Bro discloses an audio/video-call system further comprising a panic button wirelessly coupled to the second communication system, for the second user to indicate distress and for the second communication system to respond by contacting help, (Col. 2, lines 32-48; Col. 3, lines 47-54; Col. 6, line 46-40; Col. 7, lines 17-20; Col. 8, lines 38-42; Col. 9, lines 53-58; and Col. 12, lines 42-43), (Examiner notes that Bro teaches wireless communication through a one-button automatic dialer/client personal communicator, which communicator renders Applicant's panic button communication device obvious as, among other functionalities, a one-button automatic dialer/client personal communicator could obviously facilitate a means by which a patient may indicate stress or contact help). Thus, Claim 8 is found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.



Art Unit: 2143

8. Regarding Claims 16-18, Bro discloses an audio/video-call system wherein the digital data is encoded on a smart card, (per pending Claim 16), (Col. 8, lines 1-11), or stored within the first communication system, (per pending Claim 17), (Col. 10, lines 30-62), or (obviously) stored within a PDA, (per pending Claim 18), (Col. 2, lines 30-44 & Col. 3, lines 51-54) and is used to place the first communication system in the passkey mode of operation, (Examiner notes that Bro teaches a client database, a client ID number, smart cards with memory capabilities and the use of both wired and wireless communication, the combination of which renders Applicants claims unpatentable as within a system which may require an emergency response, (especially where one party may be incapacitated for instance), use of an alternative rapid means of direct connection would be obvious). Thus, Claims 16-18 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.

9. Regarding Claims 22-24, Bro discloses an audio/video-call system wherein the operator retrieves information from a database for the file which is (obviously) downloaded to the memory, (per pending Claim 22), (Col. 8, lines 15-20 & Col. 10, lines 59-62), wherein the operator communicates with the first user via an (audio/video – per pending Claim 24) phone call, (per pending Claim 23), (Col. 2, lines 30-47; Col. 5, lines 24-30; Col. 9, lines 53-58; Col. 10, lines 56-67; Col. 11; and Col. 12, lines 1-2). Thus, Claims 22-24 are found to be unpatentable over considerable consideration of Bro.

**Conclusion**


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arrienne M. Lezak whose telephone number is (703)-305-0717. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on (703)-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Arrienne M. Lezak  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

AML

  
DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100